

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 8.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

Ancient British Constitutionalism.

A. Del Mar's thesis in *Ancient Britain Revisited* (1900) was that Britain had been invaded by the Goths before the Roman conquest, and that the story of the Anglo-Saxon occupation in the fifth century was a forgery. The claim that, as an offshoot of Germania, Britain was part of the Roman Empire was consequently invalid. But this investigation, while it shows the Gothic love of freedom, also leads him to trace the institutes of freedom to the Roman Commonwealth, and his description of the principles underlying these institutes is not altogether irrelevant today.

The Goths, worshipping the sun-god IES, came from Scythia and left a trail of names behind them: Estonia, Euxine, Tam-es and Issus. Some of their descendants—the Jakbuti—“worship a triune god, one of whose personages they suspend in effigy upon a tree whilst in the act of worship.” Their signs were the svastica and the cross. Their language is still echoed in the Lake District and among cockneys. They used *baule* or ring money, of which “vast numbers have been found in Britain and Norway.” The final rupture with Rome “originated in the enforcement of the official religion. The Gothic races . . . refused to submit to hierarchical government. To regard the emperor as god and man, to surrender not only the greatest but the least of their affairs into his hands, or, which was worse, into the hands of the numerous intermediaries, was more than Gothic common sense could stand . . . In the third century the entire Gothic race in Europe rose up in revolt against a religion they could not understand and a government too distant to afford them protection of redress . . . “From the dust of the conflict sprung up four great races who today command both shores of the North Atlantic.”

Del Mar's account of the characteristics of these races makes refreshing reading, and is also a basis of comparison between the spiritual stature of those races in 1900 and at the present day: “Capacity for great physical endurance, love of freedom, home, fireside, fear of God, abhorrence of plotting, mystery, subterfuge, a passionate instinct for the sea.” He adds, “Upon this Gothic foundation their social life has reared an edifice whose materials are Constitutional Government, Supremacy of the Law, Right of Assemblage, Representation in the Comitia, Trial by Jury, Restriction of the Church to spiritual affairs.”

He ascribes the revolt of 280 A.D. to the imperial refusal of a mint, and compares it with the revolt of the North American colonies. A provincial mint was, at all events, granted. But “the monetary system of the Empire was substantially in the hands of the sovereign pontiff, who thus became the sole banker of Europe. The sacred character which the Romans attached to gold enabled him to preserve this and a few other regalian rights.” He contrasts the freedom of the Commonwealth with the centralised mono-

poly of the Empire. But to avoid the charge of republican tendencies in religion, he says, “The distinguishing trait of the Christian religion is its capacity for improvement, its adaptability to the ever changing conditions of society, and to the varied wants and aspirations of man . . . All other religions are fixed.”

Some of his notes on the Roman occupation are still interesting. “With the retirement of Agricola, the proconsuls were in many ways absolute. Like the emperor, they no longer obeyed the law but made it . . . every sack of wool exported from Britain, every pipe of wine brought in, every incident of commercial activity was laden with a tax.” Meanwhile the empire was blessed by “the virtual sale of the imperial throne to the usurer Didius Julianus,” and “everything was done by somebody else and consequently done badly.” The Goths continued to worship Thor, Woden and Friga.

Among monuments of Roman civilisation are its language, now so out of fashion, and Del Mar notes “the greater precision of Latin in the expression of thought.” While “religious eclecticism rendered practicable the expansion of the empire. To the reaction against emperor worship and the revival of eclecticism the Christian Church was largely indebted for its early growth. In the eleventh century the Church cast aside eclecticism and ceased to grow. Liberty and Christianity appear to be complementary.” Similarly, he remarked, “art cannot survive the decay of liberty.”

Blackstone built on the common law, Mr. O'Sullivan stresses the Canon Law, and Del Mar said that the ‘Civil (Roman) law—based on the Twelve Tables of 454 B.C.—was “a potent fortress to check the advances of tyranny and protect the roots of free institutions.” He complains, “It does not say much for the enterprise of our college presses that the Civil Law has never been published in the vernacular.” I do not know whether this has been remedied. It will be recalled that *classicism*, or study of the classics, is condemned in the *Protocols*, one of the handbooks of power politics.

Del Mar denies that the House of Commons could have sprung from the witangemote, which was an advisory *council*, and not a *legislature*. Moreover, “there is no instance in history of a House of Commons without a senate.” According to him, “The union of the Gothic spirit of freedom and the literature of the Roman Republic bred a demand for an engine of legislation other than the Sacred College at Rome.” The progress of the Roman House, or Houses, of Commons is instructive. First there was the Comitia Centuriata, of an “ecclesiastical and aristocratic tendency,” which elected consuls and other officials. Then the more popular Comitia Tributa gained ascendancy. “From this constitution (448 B.C.) must be dated the real glory of Rome; on it was founded the supremacy of the civil law and it rendered possible the

numerical system of money. . . . For the time the Tributa was the supreme power of the state. Like the English House of Commons, it not only co-operated with the Senate but dominated that chamber."

We may note Blackstone's warning: "In the method of centuries it was principally property, and not numbers, that turned the scale: in the method by tribes, numbers only were regarded, and property entirely overlooked. . . . Our constitution steers between the two extremes. Only such are entirely excluded as can have no will of their own." The American founding fathers worked with a limited electorate. This is not to suggest denying people a say in their own affairs. But a vote appears to give everybody a right these days to meddle in the affairs of others and is, in brief, a ticket of plunder. We shall see, in the words of Del Mar, where single chamber tyranny led Rome. There was, unfortunately, no independent executive, for the consuls were analagous to a prime minister and "candidates for offices used the same arts to gain votes as are employed now." Del Mar continues:

"The tribune Apuleius Saturninus (100 B.C.) carried a law through the comitia which provided that senators, under penalty of losing their rank, should come to the forum and swear to *confirm whatever the comitia should enact*. This was practically to dispense with the legislative function of the Senate, a highly dangerous policy in a state which contained a vast number of superstitious, uneducated and indigent citizens. . . . Within a year Rome was involved in a series of civil wars which only ended with the downfall of the comitia and the degradation of the senate to an imperial council." That was the end of legislatures for thirteen hundred years.

Del Mar describes Trial by Jury and the Writ of Habeas Corpus to the Roman Commonwealth, and has a chapter on the Prerogative of Money. The Republic established the over-valued bronze *nunni*, and the system was "rudely reflected in the Greenback system of U.S.A. of 1862-78." The flood of precious metals seduced them into erecting the species system. "The crime was in depriving the state (*i.e.*, the tributa) of the prerogative of money to bestow it on a favoured class. It was the same crime that Charles II. committed in 1666 and Alexander Hamilton in 1790. . . ." Rome was forced into the Punic wars in quest of metal. In the Empire "the sovereign-pontiff monopolized the coinage of gold." After the fall of Constantinople in 1204 "every petty monarch began to coin gold. . . . such is a brief outline of the right of the House of Commons to control the issues of money."

He describes the rude empire of the Goths, their Hanseatic League and their violent conversation which recalls a Moslem *jihad* or holy war. Power is evidently unhallowed under every imaginable cloak. Del Mar remarks: "The Gothic inhabitants of Saxony, Mecklenburg, Pomerania and Russia could have been won by milder means than robbery, rape, spoliation, slavery and the rack." The methods of power, in fact, do not alter much. He concluded that, in spite of Gothic roughness, "Something remained which was worth preserving. This was the love of liberty which the Norsemen never forgot. They had brought it from the desert and the sea, had seen it flourish in the Roman Commonwealth and were thus assured that it fitted a civilised community. They had seen it stricken down by the hierarchy and had raised it up and nourished it and kept it for posterity. Without their

fostering care, it might have been buried as deeply in Europe as it has been in India."

At present we are educated in ignorance of our heritage of freedom and of order; while a velvet gloved State removes from all piecemeal the responsibility which is inseparable from individualism. The religious are carefully diverted from any new truths. It is not mentioned that the British constitution was never a mere *democracy*, but was *mixed*. Aristotle remarked that "it is manifest that aristocracy and constitutional government are not widely apart from one another." (*Politics*). E. Pound wrote that "Aristocracy is precision." (Del Mar noted that a similar proposal to that of Saturninus was discussed in the House of Commons on 5th August, 1893, and the election of the Senate by direct vote of the people was under discussion while he was writing, in 1900. The House of Lords lost their say in Money Bills in 1911. The abolition of the House of Lords is an old socialist cry. For the matter of that, the "conservative" Lord Hailsham, when Mr. Q. Hogg appeared to have the scantest respect for the functions of the Upper House).

H. SWABEY.

In Australia

"Frank Browne, the well-known Sydney political commentator, says that Canberra is seriously contemplating the re-introduction of the wasteful and hopelessly incompetent system of centralised emergency powers that operated over the years 1939-45.

"Their excuse, of course, is that the nation must be geared to meet an emergency, and their modest claim is that when it comes to gearing industry and the nation as a whole, to meet an emergency, anything anybody else can do, they can do better.

"That we need increased production is beyond doubt. Also beyond doubt is the fact that the people least likely to get it, and most likely to hinder it, are the bureaucrats, who, as they did before, will produce nothing but regulations, which, in turn, will slow everything down.

"Ministers in the Federal Government are already showing signs that the Canberra offensive is meeting with some success. Dark hints of 'austerity,' 'sacrifice' and other only too-familiar war-time pieces of gobbledecock are popping up in Ministerial statements. The 'austerity' and 'sacrifices' are all of course to be made by people other than the bureaucrats, who will be set up as directors, deputy directors, and assistant-deputy directors of this and that. This elite will enjoy roughly the position of commissars, riding around in Government cars, and kicking the common herd around as they did before.

"There is no demand on the economy of this nation that cannot be fulfilled or most nearly fulfilled, by private enterprise. Government interference can only do what it has always done, promote inefficiency, promote graft and corruption, and waste the nation's potential.

"Now is the time for the leaders of industry to tell the Government clearly that preparedness will be in reverse ratio to the amount of Government 'organising' that takes place."—*Canberra Newsletter*.

Chapman's Georgics of Hesiod.*

(lines 270-300) "O that I might not live now, to partake

The age that must the Fifth succession make,
 But either die before, or else were born
 When all that Age is into ashes worn!
 For that which next springs, in supply of this,
 With all of Iron will produce his families;
 Whose bloods shall be so banefully corrupt
 They shall not let them sleep, but interrupt
 With toils and miseries all their rests and fares,
 The Gods such grave and soul-dissecting cares,
 Shall steep their bosoms in. And yet some good
 Will God mix with their bad; for when the blood
 Faints in their nourishment, and leaves their hair
 A little gray, Jove's hand will stop the air
 'Twixt them and life, and take them straight away.
 'Twixt men and women shall be such foul play
 In their begetting pleasures, and their race
 Spring from such false seed, that the son's stol'n face
 Shall nought be like the sire's, the sire no more
 Seen in his issue. No friend, as before,
 Shall like his friend be; nor no brother rest
 Kind like his brother; no guest like a guest
 Of former times; no child use like a child
 His aged parents, but with manners wild
 Revile and shame them; their impiety
 Shall never fear that God's all-seeing eye
 Is fixt upon them, but shall quite despise
 Repayment of their education's price,
 Bear their law in their hands, and when they get
 Their father's free-given goods, account them debt.
 City shall city ransack: not a grace
"

American "Report" on N.H.S.

The *Christian Science Monitor* has published the following concerning a report on the National Health Service in Great Britain:—

Eleven findings, many of them unfavourable, regarding the new national health service of Great Britain are made by five doctors appointed by the board of trustees of the American Medical Association to study the British system at first hand.

The doctors were directed to spend not less than six weeks in England, Wales and Scotland inquiring into the present workings of the National Health Act. They were asked to inquire particularly into its present effect on the quality of medical care and what, in their judgment, would be its probable future effect.

Their conclusions are these:

"The system that prevails in England today is certainly not all bad, but most of its virtues are those of the medical social services that existed before the act.

"1. It has accomplished the unification of a disordered hospital system and established a regional control oriented around teaching centres.

"2. It has removed the financial barrier, but this at present has benefited the middle rather than the low income group.

"3. It has established a better income level for many hospitals. This increased income has been accompanied with increased operating cost and the imposition of a burden of work that is difficult to manage with present facilities.

"4. It has made the services of consultants more readily available outside the hospitals and clinics. This has been of practical benefit in areas distant from the large hospitals.

"5. It has further widened the gap between the specialist and the general practitioner and further degraded the position of the general practitioner.

"6. It has to a large extent destroyed private practice.

"7. It has produced a greater inequality of distribution of doctors in proportion to population, and it has further rendered success in the practice of medicine depending more on quantity than quality and has diluted the quality of medicine.

"8. It has added nothing so far to preventive medicine but has disrupted public health work and produced serious problems in tuberculosis control and preventive dentistry.

"9. It has added greatly to the cost of medical care, and it has thrown a great additional load on the medical facilities of the country at a time when these facilities were already burdened and hampered after 10 years of war and post-war effort.

"10. It has failed in its primary objective of effective certification control under the comprehensive insurance plan.

"11. It has created an almost complete autocratic control of medicine through concentration of financial power in the central government and the authority given the minister to govern by directions having the weight of law."

In their comments on shortcomings of the British system, the American doctors said that most of the British doctors and many administrators were conscious of the defects of the system pointed out in their report.

They noted that absenteeism from work due to illness was increasing rather than diminishing.

"The answer is found," they said, "partly in the fact that the insurance allowance for sickness may equal the wages in certain low-income groups, but more particularly in the changed relationship of the patient and doctor. The patient is in a position to demand what he wants. He has an economic weapon that he does not hesitate to use. If he is not granted what he demands, whether it is an ambulance ride, a drug, reference to a hospital or a certificate, he can remove himself, his family and his friends from a doctor's list. The doctor has completely lost his independence, since he can no longer gain economic freedom outside the medical monopoly established and controlled by the state.

"Abuses of the service are evident everywhere, and they must lead to more and more regulations, tighter enforcement, greater penalties for violation, further limitations on freedom, and further deterioration of the quality of medicine. In the end the great consumer group will suffer most. Sad as is the state of the practitioner of medicine in Britain, the plight of medicine itself is more serious; but what is most to be deplored is the present and future effect on the quality of medical care received by the English people."

The survey was made by Dr. Walter B. Martin of Norfolk, Va., Dr. Grover C. Penberthy of Detroit, Dr.

* Eighth century B.C.

(Continued on page 6.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone SEFTon Park 435.

Vol. 25. No. 8. Saturday, October 21, 1950

From Week to Week

"Marcus Eli Ravage scarcely exaggerated when he boasted,

"You have not begun to appreciate the real depth of our guilt. We are intruders. We are disturbers. We are subverters. We have taken your natural world, your ideals, your destiny, and played havoc with them. We have been at the bottom not merely of the latest great war but of nearly all your wars, not only of the Russian (Communist) but of every other major revolution in history. We have brought discord and confusion and frustration into your personal and public life. We are still doing it. No one can tell how long we shall go on doing it."—*Century Magazine*, January, 1928.

A friend writing from Australia observes:

"Dr. — is just back from the World Congress of Radiologists recently held in London. — was very strong on the obviously depleted physique of the British and their crying need for good food and plenty of it.

"There's any amount of food in the country, and I had it on good authority that it is a Jew-Communist plot utterly to break the stamina of the British people. As — is a specialist of world-wide reputation, it is unlikely that such a statement would be lightly made."

"There never was a time when so few people anywhere could say with any confidence under what institutions, regimes or ethos they would be living in ten or twenty years' time. England has not escaped the growing world-wide instability, which is the natural result of elevating the passions of mass electorates to be the dominating influence in the ordering of society."—*The Tablet*, October 7.

We are pleased that a situation which has steadily been getting worse for two hundred years is receiving attention, if not intervention.

It must, of course, now be evident even to the non-technical, that the feature of genuine private enterprise which is so disliked both by International Finance and Socialism (they are really only different aspects of the same motive) is its stark efficiency considered in relation to its various objectives. This definition should be grasped, because the ostensible objective of nationalised or cartelised activity is rarely its real purpose. For instance, cheap, comfortable, safe and rapid transport is quite a minor factor in British Railways. "Full Employment," the political power of the railway Trades Unions, "Jobs for the Boys" with luxurious junketings to

inspect overseas systems which are pronounced solemnly to be interesting but not superior to "our" own, all come before transport.

There is nothing new in all this; the transition from a transport tool to a financial counter, and then to a political organisation has been repeated in dozens of countries, and always (bearing in mind the progress of the industrial arts, which is completely independent of administrative systems) with a steady fall in the achievement of satisfaction to the original objective of the undertaking, the consumer.

The comment on the Vesting of the Iron and Steel industry is, from its almost uniform nature, a further instance of the central control of Press political inspiration.

If there is any genuine historical analysis of the era through which we are passing, the amazing swindle of "acquiring" property by paying for it with money robbed either by taxation or inflation (coin-clipping) from the owners of the property so acquired, must attract close attention.

Bearing in mind the type of individual dominant in effective politics to-day, it is not remarkable that a trick of this nature should be attempted. It would be more remarkable if it were not.

But what does verge upon the miraculous is that hardly a word is said to emphasise the nature of the fraudulent prospectus, or the absolute certainty of its detonation of British credit.

But perhaps that is the Big Idea.

Social Credit

Under the above heading, the following appeared in the *Catholic Herald* for October 13:—

"Sir,

"Once again, for the umpteenth time, somebody cries out for something positive, neither Left nor Right, neither East nor West, neither Marxism nor Capitalism. Well, let him apply, as all the rest have done, to the C.S.G. [Catholic Social Guild] whose officials will certainly encourage him to believe, even if they don't actually say so, that they have the answer. They have not got the answer, and they are quite determined that nobody else shall discover it.

"There was a time when, very broadly speaking, economic and dogmatic teaching were 'combined.' We have to take the outstanding economic practice of that time, to wit, 'The Just Price,' and apply it to the complexity of 20th century conditions. Major Douglas has shown us how to do this, once and for all; and Social Credit is the answer we want.

"L. B. FORREST,

"Roundways, Compton Down, Winchester."

Baruchracy

Sir,—You rightly state that:—"It is probable that most wars have been fought for reasons quite other than those publicly protested." World Wars I and II, were fought for the greater glory of Bernard Baruch. A Third World War could result in making Baruch King of the World, and that is the real object of the One-Worlders and the United Nations merchants.

Yours faithfully,

London, October 14, 1950.

GEOFFREY BOWLES.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons, September 15, 1950.

National Service Bill—Second Reading.

Brigadier Clarke (Portsmouth, West): As an ex-Regular soldier, I share the views of the two hon. Members who have just spoken with regard to conscription. Conscription is foreign to this country and not something which we want to retain, and I should like to see it brought to an end as soon as possible, but it is the mis-management and vacillation of the Labour Party that has made it necessary. It was not possible for a man to join the Army during the last four or five years on the rates of pay which then existed, for the cost of living rose month by month. When I joined the Army the soldier got little money; he has never been well paid—

Mr. Collick (Birkenhead): One shilling a day.

Mr. Leslie Hale: He is better off today than he has ever been.

Brigadier Clarke: He was then able to buy a packet of cigarettes and two or three pints of beer, but the soldier has not been able to do so during the last four or five years. One packet of cigarettes was his day's pay.

Mr. Shurmer (Birmingham, Sparkbrook): Would the hon. and gallant Gentleman allow me—

Brigadier Clarke: I am sorry, but I have only a few minutes and I want to speak without interruption. The soldier has now been given a fairly reasonable wage. That was forced on the Government after the Secretary of State for War, the Minister of Defence and others had resisted it to the last possible moment. That is why we have still got conscription five years after the war. That is the sole reason. If we had paid the men better before we should have had the volunteers. More needs to be done. Pensioners and war widows have still more due to them, and their case must be looked into. The best recruiting agent for the Services is the ex-Service man. If he leaves the Service a satisfied man, he will put his son and his grandson into the volunteer Army.

Mr. Shurmer rose—

Brigadier Clarke: I am sorry, but I have only two minutes left. In those circumstances we should not need conscription. Nothing reasonable has been done for the pensioner or the war widow. If our men have to go and be killed—[HON. MEMBERS: "Rubbish."]—in Korea, the Secretary of State for War should look into the pensions which are to be paid to widows. That is most essential.

I have very little time left and I want to strike a different note. I urge His Majesty's Government to look into the credentials of the Secretary of State for War—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker (Colonel Sir Charles MacAndrew): I do not see how that could arise on this Bill.

Hon. Members: Withdraw.

Brigadier Clarke: I was just about to say how it arose. Men should not be asked to go and fight Communism under a man who is a professed Communist. [HON. MEMBERS: "Withdraw."] I will not withdraw unless I am called upon to do so by Mr. Deputy-Speaker. It is my opinion as a soldier—

Mr. Ellis Smith: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. I understand that right hon. and hon. Members are not allowed to make imputations against other right hon. and

hon. Members. In accordance with Standing Orders, should not the imputations which have been made now be withdrawn?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I stopped the hon. and gallant Gentleman on a different point, that his remarks were outside the scope of the Bill, which I believe to be quite direct and definite. After I had stopped him he said that I had misunderstood him and I was waiting to hear why he felt that I had misunderstood him.

Mr. Keenan (Liverpool, Kirkdale): The hon. and gallant Gentleman was accusing the Minister of War of being, in effect, a Communist, and because of that I must rise to support the point of order. Particularly on such an important subject as this, no hon. Member should be allowed to accuse the responsible Minister of being something which he is not. Such a categorisation would have an adverse effect on recruitment. I do not think that any hon. Member, particularly one who has served in the Forces as long as the hon. and gallant gentleman has done—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Gentleman has apparently risen to make a speech. He cannot make that speech now. It is not a point of order. Brigadier Clarke.

Brigadier Clarke rose—

Mr. Ellis Smith: My point of order, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, was not based on the word which has been reiterated but on the phrase which was used. May I ask if you heard it? As I understood it, the phrase was to the effect that the hon. and gallant Gentleman wanted to ask the Government to look into the credentials of the Secretary of State for War. If you accept the fact that that phrase was used, I submit that these serious statements have gone on far too long and that the phrase should now be withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not think that is out of order. I stopped the hon. and gallant Gentleman on a different point. I considered that he was going beyond the scope of the Bill.

Brigadier Clarke: I did not say that the right hon. Gentleman is a Communist. I was referring to his past tendencies. I never said that he is; I said that he was—

Mr. Isaacs: That is a coward's statement. [Interruption.]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. and gallant Gentleman was trying to explain why he felt that I had misunderstood him. [HON. MEMBERS: "He is repeating it."] Order. I pointed out to the hon. and gallant Gentleman that I thought that what he was saying was outside the scope of the Bill. He said that I was wrong and he is now seeking to show why I am wrong. He ought to be allowed to do so. I shall stop him again if he does not convince me.

Brigadier Clarke: Our men are fighting Communism in Korea, and the Secretary of State for War has admitted in the past that he was a Communist—

Mr. Isaacs: Nonsense!

The Parliamentary and Financial Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. James Callaghan): On a point of order, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. This has absolutely nothing at all to do with the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In my opinion, it had nothing whatever to do with the Bill. My ruling was challenged and the hon. and gallant Gentleman is seeking to show why I am wrong. He must be allowed to show I am wrong. If I am

wrong I shall allow him to continue.

The Minister of Defence (Mr. Shinwell): Is it not obvious, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that in explaining why he made his previous statement the hon. and gallant Gentleman is about to refer personally to the Secretary of State for War and that that is outwith the scope of the Bill?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That was my view, and I stopped him on that ground, but he said that I had misunderstood him and he is explaining why he feels that I misunderstood him. If in my opinion he goes beyond the scope of the Bill I shall very soon stop him.

Brigadier Clarke: Hon. Gentlemen opposite as a whole have done more to make my point for me than I have. All I hope is that the Prime Minister will shuffle the pack and manipulate—

Mr. Isaacs: An hon. and gallant Gentleman!

The Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture (Mr. George Brown): Neither gallant nor honourable.

Mr. Kirkwood (Dunbartonshire, East): On a point of order, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Will all due respect, although the hon. and gallant Gentleman has been an officer in the British Army, he is not going to be allowed to treat a Minister in the Government of this party in that fashion—

Mr. Shurmer: Do not let the hon. and gallant Gentleman get up.

Mr. Kirkwood: You have decided, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that what he was saying was outside the scope of the Bill and yet you are allowing him to proceed to an explanation. I ask you to make him sit down and behave himself.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought I had made my position perfectly clear. I said I thought that what the hon. and gallant Member was developing was outside the scope of the Bill and, therefore, out of order. To that he said I had misunderstood, and was giving an explanation, but I hope, in view of the time, that he will go on to his next point. Brigadier Clarke.

Brigadier Clarke: It is only fair I should have my say, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. I feel that the Prime Minister should shuffle the pack.

Hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot see that the hon. and gallant Member has said anything to prove that my first contention was wrong.

Brigadier Clarke: I am sorry. I have had very little chance to speak owing to the touchiness of hon. Gentlemen opposite. There is no doubt that nearly all share my views, only they do not like having it said publicly, and I am glad I have had the opportunity of saying this. [An HON. MEMBER: "Withdraw."] I have not said anything against the Minister of Defence. I am told that he is now doing his very best for the Army and, while he is doing it, I will give him every possible support even if during the Defence Debate he did say that no one could foresee the present situation three years ago. All I can say is that as a crystal gazer he is pretty poor. But if he is trying now—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I think that is quite outside the scope of the Bill.

Mr. Kirkwood: The hon. and gallant Member may be serving in the British Army but he is no gentleman.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, Brigadier Clarke.

Mr. Kirkwood: No wonder we cannot get recruits.

Brigadier Clarke: I have heard a lot of derogatory remarks about myself from the other side. They say I am neither gallant nor a gentleman. Well, at least I have been in uniform and I have been in it for seven years—[An HON. MEMBER: "So was the Secretary of State for War."]—and I think I might have a chance of saying—

Mr. Isaacs: Say it as a soldier, not as a cad.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I heard a word used which should not have been used. I do not know who said it.

Mr. Callaghan: Make the hon. and gallant Member speak to the Bill or sit down.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am quite able to control affairs if I am given a chance to do so. Brigadier Clarke.

Brigadier Clarke: I have stayed long over the time I promised you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, but it is entirely due to the interruptions opposite. I would like the Minister of Defence to look into the question of pensions and widows' pensions before we go any further—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is also outside the scope of the Bill.

Mr. William Ross (Kilmarnock): Why did not the hon. and gallant Member read the Bill before he spoke?

Brigadier Clarke: I thought, as we are discussing whether we should have a Regular Army as opposed to 24 months conscription, it was reasonable to make that point. That is what it amounts to. We have missed having a Regular Army and now we must have two years' conscription, entirely due to the mismanagement of that side of the House.

Before ending, I want to say that these men who have gone out from Hong Kong to Korea now find that the considerable rise in pay which they had the other day has been cut because they are not to get their local Hong Kong allowance. I would remind the Minister that a lot of them have left wives behind whose expenses are just the same whether a man is sleeping in a fox hole or in some comfort in Hong Kong. These National Service men should get the same rate of pay as the regulars serving in Korea, and should not lose the allowances recently given them, thereby bringing them down to the same rate of pay as they have been getting in the past.

AMERICAN "REPORT" ON N.H.S. (Contd. from Page 3.)

Heyworth N. Sanford of Chicago, Dr. Ulrich R. Bryner of Salt Lake City, and Dr. Carl M. Petersen of Chicago. Their report is printed in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of *annual* subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, Croft House, Denmead, Portsmouth.

Bertrand Russell.

The New Times (Melbourne) for August 11 says:—

It would be ridiculous to suggest that Bertrand Russell is a man of evil intent. But we do suggest that he is being used by evil forces which seek to enslave the peoples of this world. At present in Australia under the auspices of the Australian Institute of International Affairs, Bertrand Russell has been receiving enormous press and radio publicity. Experience has shown that the only individuals to-day who are given access to the centralised organs used for influencing public opinion, are those who advocate the centralisation of power. And it is this advocacy of the centralisation of power which is the central theme of all Bertrand Russell's talks and articles.

Bertrand Russell is claimed to be a great and profound philosopher, but the very man who once wrote a book on the danger of power, and who is always talking about individual liberty and independence, strongly advocates a world government. Now it is a fact of human experience that the bigger and more centralised Governments become, irrespective of whether they are labelled "democratic" or "Fascist," the more oppressive they become and the less liberty and independence the individual has. Local, decentralised government is the fundamental essential for genuine democracy. And yet it is this very essential which Bertrand Russell and his sponsors are so subtly undermining with their totalitarian propaganda masquerading as "philosophy."

Apart from his advocacy of world government, Bertrand Russell has been advancing his Socialist ideas in a number of specious arguments which unfortunately no doubt have had some effect upon a gullible public. While painting a vivid picture of the danger of world Communism, this "philosopher" advocates the very Socialism which the Communists say is essential to "soften up" a community prior to the imposition of their ideas. He claims that State enterprise is all right so long as there is "democracy." Bertrand Russell says a great deal about democracy without attempting to define it. But we presume that he means voting at elections. And this "democracy is the best device hitherto invented to safeguard citizens against arbitrary acts of the Government."

But again human experience has proved that it is only the effective division of all power, and constitutional safeguards which maintain this division, which safeguard the individual's rights and liberties. It has been the breaking down of constitutional safeguards and the manipulating of the voting system which has progressively led to less and less genuine independence for the individual. Bertrand Russell has had nothing to say about these matters. In fact, since being in Australia, we have not noted one observation of his which makes any contribution to a solving of our problems. We have no doubt that if he did make any such contribution it would not be long before he would be denied access to the press and radio.

REALISTIC CONSTITUTIONALISM

(Notes for an Address to the Constitutional Research Association at Brown's Hotel, Mayfair, May 8, 1947)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

K.R.P. Publications

SIXPENCE (Postage 1d.)

Correspondence.

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*,
Sir,

In view of the very short time left to us for the reversal of our social direction, I think it undesirable to enter into any great comment on Mr. N. F. Webb's article entitled "In the Line of Truth." This can be done when we turn the old nag round and start driving home!

But for the sake of our many Catholic sympathisers, one matter of alleged fact is deserving of notice, *viz.*, "The Church of Rome is the only religious organisation that, to our knowledge, has definitely pronounced against Social Credit at the highest levels."

I have studied the various definitions of Social Credit and agree that they all shed some light on the factors involved in our living together on this globe but I fail to find any single moral issue which can be attached to the term. So it can be said without fear of contradiction that there never was or never will be an authoritative ecclesiastical pronouncement either for or against "Social Credit."

As is well known the Church's preoccupation is solely in the spheres of faith and morals and since social crediters do not presume to elaborate a theology we are confined to the common ground of moral questions. So far as I know a plain moral issue has never been submitted to Rome by any persons calling themselves social crediters. There is no need of it in face of the very clear papal encyclicals. But what is necessary is to keep our local clergy and people up to the mark, not by shouting the magic words "Social Credit," but by telling them our objectives unobscured by technicalities.

When we consider human nature it is not surprising that opposition should be met at all levels clerical and lay, but in seeking for a reason for antagonism I would suggest that we first blame our own blundering incompetent efforts.

Yours, *etc.*,

PASCO LANGMAID.

Ross-on-Wye, October 1, 1950.

Mr. Churchill

So far as can be gathered from *The Times'* report of Mr. Churchill's speech to the Conservative Party Conference at Blackpool, the ex-Prime Minister did not reiterate his demand for a "world super-government" made at Copenhagen. Instead he gave his opinion that "there may be time—though no one can guarantee it—to build up a European army with strong aid from Britain, the United States and Canada." The difference may have no political significance—and probably has none.

County and National Park

A proposal of the National Parks Commission to include 84 square miles of the West Riding of Yorkshire in the Peak District National Park is to be opposed by the town and country planning committee of the West Riding on the ground Derbyshire and Yorkshire are totally dissimilar.

For correct information concerning the Constitution of
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
 Social Crediters and others are invited to apply for
 the Statement published in July, 1949, (*postage 1d.*)
 K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The following Groups and Associations are registered
 as working in association with the Social Credit Secretariat:—

GREAT BRITAIN

- ABERDEEN D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., W. J. Sim, 18 Adelphi, Aberdeen.
- BELFAST D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., L. A. Lyons, 42, Upper Carehill Road, Belfast.
- BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., A. Davies, 73 Manor Road, Blackpool.
- BRADFORD D.S.C. Group.
- CARDIFF D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., Miss H. Pearce, 8 Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
- GLASGOW D.S.C. Group: W. Forrester, 81 Mitchell Street, Glasgow, C. 1.
- LIVERPOOL D.S.C.A. Hon. Sec., Mrs. Trayler, 67 Caldwell Road, Liverpool, 19.
- LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
- MIDLAND D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. Sanders, 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
- NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE and GATESHEAD D.S.C. Association. Hon. Sec., J. W. Coward, 13, Holly Avenue, N/c. 3.
- PORTSMOUTH and SOUTHSEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., Mrs. Waite, 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor, Portsmouth.
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., F. G. Feather, 7 Drake Road, Westcliffe-on-Sea, Essex.
- SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., C. Daish, 19 Merridale Road, Bitterne, Southampton.
- STOCKTON D.S.C. Group: L. Gilling Smith, Eastrea, Durham Road, Stockton.

Registered Groups are also working at LEPTON (Yorkshire), and WOKING. Enquiries concerning these should be addressed c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

EUROPE Hon. Secretary

COPENHAGEN D.S.C. Group. J. P. Gjerulff.

AUSTRALIA

New South Wales

THE AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL CREDITER.

(H. A. Scouler, Editor).

D.S.C.A. AND ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN OF N.S.W.

Miss K. W. Marlow.

SYDNEY D.S.C. Group.

Miss Grace Marsden.

DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH.

Roy Gustard.

COWPER D.S.C. Group.

J. McDonald.

NEWCASTLE (N.C.W.) D.S.C. Group

B. V. Murray.

BELMONT D.S.C. Group.

S. H. Morrow

BATHURST D.S.C. Group.

R. R. Brazier.

SUTHERLAND V.P.A.

W. Prescott.

South Australia

ADELAIDE D.S.C. Group.

C. H. Allen.

Western Australia

PERTH D.S.C. Group.

W. F. Andrews.

EAST PERTH V.P.A.

F. Jones.

Queensland

QUEENSLAND D.S.C. Association.

A. W. Noakes.

Victoria

HEADQUARTERS Group.

L. C. Hargreaves.

MELBOURNE D.S.C. Groups:

A Group.

A. J. O'Callaghan.

B Group.

F. C. Paice.

C Group.

Miss G. F. Greig.

D Group.

K. Macdonald.

Tasmania

HOBART D.S.C. Group.

James Guthrie.

NEW ZEALAND

AVONDALE D.S.C. Group.

F. Allen.

AUCKLAND D.S.C. Group.

Mrs. W. James.

PAEROA D.S.C. Group.

H. A. Hamilton.

PATEA ELECTORATE V.P. Association

G. J. Billingham.

CANADA

Honorary Affiliate: The Douglas Social Credit Council of Alberta.

OTTAWA (Parliamentary) D.S.C. Group

VANCOUVER D.S.C. Group.

J. Vans Macdonald.

LIVERPOOL (Nova Scotia) D.S.C. Group

T. E. D. Watson.

To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

*Associations desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in the following:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members

of Association

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat.†

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy for every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Deputy's Signature.....

To accompany the above form, a brief statement is requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,

Director of Organisation and Overseas Relations.

*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.